

THE CRISIS.

Devoted to the Support of the Democratic Principles of Jefferson.

"Union, harmony, self-denial, concession---everything for the Cause, nothing for Men."

No. 27.

RICHMOND, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 2, 1840.

VOL. I.

TERMS.

THE CRISIS will be printed in quarto form, on a medium sheet, with new type. The price \$1—and no paper will be sent to any person, without payment in advance, postage paid. As nothing short of a very large and effective subscription can justify the continuation of the paper, the above terms will be strictly adhered to. We mean to make no debts at all. We abjure all credit in this establishment, and insist upon the Cash System.

POLITICS.

AUGUST 27, 1840.

Dear Sir—In compliance with the resolution of the "Democratic Association of Richmond," I send you for publication the speech delivered by me before it a few meetings past. I have written it from memory. It is, I believe, as near the original as speeches generally are, written out under such circumstances. In one or two particulars I have somewhat amplified the testimony, as well as the argument.

I regret I could not furnish it sooner—my usual business vocations prevented.

With the highest respect,

WM. F. WATSON.

TH. RITCHIE, Esq., Editor Enquirer.

MR. PRESIDENT: I thank the members of the Association, for their kind response to the call made upon me to address them. I fear it will not be in my power to redeem the time that I may consume, either creditably to myself or profitably to them; the political topics of the day have been so variously and ably handled by the veterans in the cause, that a mere tyro, like myself, cannot promise much. However, I see around me those who I know assemble here for the good of their cause and of their country—whose hearts beat high with a patriotic ardour for the success of the great principles they are contending for. In their bosoms I will find a response to whatever I may say, with a generosity that will, I know, make allowances for defects. To an individual, who is not disposed to be entirely passive to the events daily enacting in the political world, there is much to be found affording as well amusement as mortification—amusement, to see the ambidexterous movements of our opponents, their tricks, devices, and humbuggery—mortification, to contemplate, that, in a Government, such as ours, emphatically of the People, such desperate and degrading means should be resorted to, to mislead their passions and stifle their understandings; and that too, by a party who profess to have so much intelligence. Verily, their veneration for the people cannot equal their declarations, when they dare thus to insult them. Let us, if you please, Mr. President, look into the political log book of Wm. H. Harrison, the great Federalist nominee now before the country: let us examine the bearings and reckonings of this political Proteus—yes, sir, this FEDERALIST—and I ask is he not? have we not the proof? Let us examine—what says Mr. Mills, one of the venerable Vice Presidents of the Democratic Indiana Convention? He was assisted to the stand, and said in a voice weakened by age, "That he was in Cincinnati when 'Gen. Harrison returned from Congress, at one time during the administration of John Adams, with a black cockade in his hat, and that all the Federalists in the city followed his example, and hoisted the odious badge of Federalism.'" What said Judge Wick of Indiana, to the multitude, at the late celebration at Shuter's Hill, (near Alexandria,) "That he had the statement from an old citizen of Indiana, whose character was above suspicion or impeachment, that the Gen. was a Federalist, and for months to his knowledge had worn the black cockade of the Federal party, and sustained the administration of John Adams. I know the witness, I know his character, and I as implicitly believe his statement, as I believe anything, except the Bible."—Listen to the evidence of Robert Price, a respectable citizen of Trumbull county, Ohio, deposed to before F. S. P. Stevens, one of the Judges of the court of common pleas of the county of Erie, on the 20th June, 1839: "At the time of the great political excitement, when the Federal party wore the black cockade as a badge of distinction, that he frequently saw him (Harrison) and heard him converse on political matters at that time, and that he knows him to have been a member of the Federal party at that time; has frequently seen him wear the black cockade badge of Federalism attached to his hat; and that he distinctly remembered hearing him observe in an argument in favor of the Sedition Law, in the presence of Charles Pemberton and others, that he thought it was proper for the President, the heads of the Departments, and members of Congress, to have a shield

thrown around them, that they should not be in the mouth of every blackguard that walked the street; and further the deponent saith not.

ROBERT PRICE.

"Affirmed to and subscribed before me this 20th day of June, in the year of our Lord 1840.

FREDERICK P. STEVENS."

But, Sir, this is not all. Listen to the extract from a letter of John Fowler of Lexington, Kentucky, a member of Congress in the days of Adams and Jefferson, in reply to the query, "On which side of the question did Gen. Harrison take his stand? Was he a Federalist? Did he hoist the black cockade?" &c.: "LEXINGTON, June 27, 1840.

"Dear Sir: In answer to your letter of this date, I will say that I was in Congress as a member during the great struggle between Jefferson and Adams, and know the fact that William Henry Harrison, then a Delegate from the North Western Territory, was upon the side of Mr. Adams. He was a Federalist, and wore the black cockade. JOHN FOWLER.

"Capt. HENRY DANIEL."

What is the testimony of Capt. Jacob White, a most respectable witness, whose character is sustained by the report of the Congressional Committee of Revolutionary Pensions?

[From the Maysville Monitor.]

"BLACK COCKADEISM—MORE TESTIMONY!—At the meeting of the Democratic Association, held at the Town House on Saturday night last, Captain Jacob White, one of that race of men whose Revolutionary labors will long be held in remembrance by the American people, was called upon for a speech, and in the course of his remarks, alluded to General Harrison. He said he had for a long period of time, been upon the most intimate terms with him, and he well knows that he has seen Gen. Harrison wear the black cockade. Capt. White said he had lived in Cincinnati, and saw Gen. H. upon his return from Congress, and distinctly recollects that he had mounted that badge of Federalism. Capt. White's veracity is unimpeachable, and no man entertained a higher opinion of him than Gen. Harrison himself, and of this fact Capt. White has abundant evidences in a number of letters and other papers from under General Harrison's own hand. Here then is another undoubted evidence of General Harrison's devotion to the odious principles of the administration of John Adams. Will men professing to be the followers of Jefferson, Madison and Monroe, obey the promptings of a base and ambitious faction of office-seekers, and give their support to such a man?

"When Capt. White addressed a large meeting of the Democratic party a few weeks ago, at Slickaway, Ohio, the Maysville Eagle, in derision of that venerable patriot, asked, 'Who was that old soldier?' For its information, we quote the following extract from a report made to Congress by the Committee of Revolutionary Pensions, on the 25th February, 1839:

"The petitioner, Jacob White, the committee are informed by the Commissioner of Pensions, is now in the receipt of a pension granted to him on his application. He now applies to Congress to have that pension increased.

"From the examination of his papers, it appears that Capt. White was a brave and meritorious officer, employed in many perilous services, in all of which he acquitted himself with high honor to himself and benefit to his country."

Sir, I ask, in this concurrent testimony, from various quarters, can there be a doubt as to the fact, that Mr. Harrison wore this badge of Federalism. You will observe, too, that Mr. Price's testimony establishes the fact of his not only wearing the black cockade, but of being the defender of the odious Sedition Law of the Elder Adams. Doubts must be dissipated, if any have existed, and that he was a Federalist, none can have the hardihood to deny: this circumstance, so clearly and indubitably made out, small as it is, speaks trumpet-tongued. We would as soon expect to learn that those who fought for and achieved the liberties of our country were enlisted under the Lion of Great Britain, as to suppose for a moment that a man clothed with these insignia should be a member of the Republican party. It shews, that when he received his benediction from the high functionaries of his political church, he made his baptism complete by mounting this emblem, and emphatically said, Amen! But, Mr. President, proof need not stop here, ample as it is; we might derive additional, from the fact, that the presses of the country, devoted to his cause, do not deny the charge.

We have additional evidence of his Federalism, in the debate that took place between himself and Mr. Randolph, in the Senate of the U. S., in 1826, on the Cumberland Road bill. His own admissions, as to his being identified with the Federal party, are so strong, that it is only necessary to state them to carry conviction.—Hear Mr. Randolph: "Now, Sir, the only difference between the gentleman from Ohio and myself, is this, and it is vital: That gentleman and myself differ fundamentally and totally, and did differ when we first took our seats in Congress—he, as a delegate from the Territory Northwest of the river Ohio, I, as a member of the other house, from the State of Virginia. He was an open, zealous, frank supporter of the Sedition Law and Black Cockade Administration, and I was as zealous, and frank, and open an opponent of the Black Cockade and Sedition Law Administration. We differ fundamentally and totally—we never can agree about measures or about men. I do not mean to dictate to the gentleman—let us agree to differ as gentlemen ought to do, especially natives of the same State, who are antipodes to each other in politics. He, I acknowledge, just now the zenith and I the nadir." What said Mr. Harrison in reply, denying being in favor of the Alien and Sedition Laws? He said, "He has been pleased to say, that, in the administration of Mr. Adams, I was a Federalist; and he comes to that conclusion from the course pursued by me in the session of 1799-1800.—At that session, the gentleman and myself met for the first time—he in the station of Representative from Virginia, and I in the more humble one of Delegate from the Northwestern Territory. Having no vote, I did not think proper to take part in the discussion of any of the great political questions which divided the two parties. My business was to procure the passage of the bills which I had introduced for the benefit of the people I represented.—The gentleman had no means of knowing my political principles, unless he obtained them from private conversation. As I was upon terms of intimacy with the gentleman, it is very probable that he might have heard me express sentiments favorable to the then Administration. I certainly felt them—so far at least as to the course pursued by it in relation to the Government of France. Nor, said Mr. H., was I unsupported in that opinion by those who had a right to control my actions, if not my opinions. In no part of the country were those measures more decidedly approbated, than by my immediate constituents, the Legislature of the N. W. Territory, as the address of that body to the President during that session will show. For Mr. Adams, I entertained at that time, and have ever since entertained, the greatest respect. I believed him to be an honest man and a pure patriot, and his conduct during that session, proved him to be such. This opinion, I know, said Mr. H., was entertained by those two able and upright statesmen, John Marshall and Jas. A. Bayard."—Here, then, he stands by his own admission, the friend and admirer of John Adams and his administration, with the exception stated: and invoking to his aid, to strengthen his position, the fact of his being identified in this friendship and admiration, with John Marshall and James A. Bayard—the former receiving his appointment as Chief Justice from John Adams, and one of the leaders of the Federal party—the latter, when in Congress, voting for the Sedition Law, and who voted for Burr for President in preference to Jefferson.—Worthy compeers, no doubt—but most notorious Federalists. Remember the old adage—"Tell me the company a man keeps, and I will tell you his character." Mark, Sir, he refers you to the proceedings of the Legislature of the Territory, as supporting him in his favorable opinions of the administration of John Adams! And what are those proceedings? Mark them well, I ask you! Here is an extract embodying all that it is now important to refer to:

"But happily for America, you chose to continue in public life, till the confidence of your fellow-citizens, at a critical moment, placed you at the helm of State; and permit us, sir, to assure you that we are deeply impressed with a sense of the wisdom, justice and firmness with which you have discharged this important trust: and we take this early opportunity of assuring you of our sincere attachment to the American Constitution and Government, and of our determination to afford every possible support to both.

"We believe that regardless of party spirit, which has striven to distract our national councils, you have kept the honor and happiness of the nation constantly in

view; and we ardently pray that the wise Ruler of Nations may preserve your health and life.

EDWARD TIFFIN,
Speaker of the H. of R.
H. VANDERBURGH,
President of the Council."

In all conscience here is approbation enough—all and every act of the Reign of Terror—Alien law, Sedition Law, Standing Army—the whole, from Alpha to Omega—stand here approbated to the fullest extent. Well indeed, may Mr. H. say, "nor was I unsupported in that opinion by those who had a right to control my actions if not my opinions."—Strange, indeed, would it be to find that such a constituency had a Republican for their representative.—A Feudal Lord never had more trusty vassals or more loyal subjects, than did the elder Adams in these Territories. But, Mr. President, there is a reminiscence connected with this discussion, and recent developments that add greatly to its whole interest and importance. The debate I have given, is to be found in Gales & Seaton's Congressional Debates, vol. 2d part 1st, p. 359. It took place on the 20th of March, 1826. On the 22d of that month, that portion delivered by Mr. Randolph appeared in the National Intelligencer, and on the 24th of the same month, two days afterwards, you will observe, Mr. Harrison's reply is published in the same paper—of course giving to Mr. H. the advantage of having seen Mr. R.'s remarks in print, and enabling Mr. H. thereby the more fully and accurately to report his reply—of which advantage, it is to be presumed, he availed himself, particularly when we refer to the pointed manner in which the Intelligencer notices the reply. Mr. H.'s reply was made on the 20th; but on a second motion of Mr. Cobbs—the debate on this second motion being called the second debate—the Editors of the Intelligencer say, "We shall not be able soon to give that second debate; but justice to Mr. H., it is thought, requires that his reply to Mr. R. should not suffer a like delay, and we therefore give it earlier publication." Sir, was there ever anything of the kind that appeared to exhibit more point, deliberation and exactitude; and that on the part of Mr. H., is it not evidence conclusive, that the discussion is here recorded as it took place? But what, Sir, do we now see? Why, a garbled and mutilated exhibit of this very discussion—and for what purpose? To break its force, to destroy its power. It was and is looked upon as potent in itself to identify Mr. H. with Federalism, and hence this fraudulent exhibition! Let us examine the matter. I quote from the Tippecanoe Text Book, page 61 and 62:

As soon as Mr. Randolph had taken his seat, General Harrison arose, and observed: "That the extraordinary manner in which his name had been brought before the Senate, by the Senator from Virginia, probably required some notice from him, though he scarcely knew how to treat such a charge as had been advanced against him seriously. The gentleman had charged him with being a Black Cockade Federalist of '98, and with having voted for the standing army and the alien and sedition laws. He had not so fertile a memory as the gentleman from Virginia, nor could he at command call up all the transactions of nearly thirty years ago. He could say, however, that at the time alluded to, he was not a party man in the sense the Senator from Virginia used. He was a delegate of a Territory which was just then rising into importance, and having no vote on the general questions before Congress, it was neither his duty nor the interest of those whom he represented to plunge into the turbulent sea of general politics which then agitated the nation. There were questions of great importance to the North-western Territory before Congress—questions, upon the proper settlement of which, the future prosperity of that now important portion of the Union greatly depended. Standing as he did, the sole Representative of that Territory, his greatest ambition was to prove himself faithful to his trust, by cherishing its interests; and nothing could have been more suicidal or pernicious to those he represented, than for him to exasperate either party by becoming a violent partizan, without the power of aiding either party, because he had no vote on any political question. This was his position, and although he had his political principles as firmly fixed as those of the gentleman from Virginia, it was no business of his to strike where he could not be felt, and where the blow must recoil upon himself and those whom he represented. He wore no cockade, black or tri-colored, at that day—and never wore one but when he was in the military service of his country. But he was seriously charged with the heinous offence of association with Federal gentlemen. He pleaded guilty—he respected the revolutionary services of President Adams, and had paid him that courtesy which was due to him as a man and as Chief Magistrate. He also associated with such men as John Marshall and James A. Bayard—Was the acknowledgment of such guilt to throw him out of the pale of political salvation?"

"On the other hand, he was on intimate terms with Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Gallatin, and with the whole Virginia delegation, among whom he had many kinsmen and dear friends. They were his political associates

in Philadelphia, in whose mess he had often met the gentleman who was now his accuser, and with whom he had spent some of the happiest hours of his life. It was true, as the Senator had alleged, he had been appointed Governor of the North-western territory by John Adams—so had he been by Thomas Jefferson and James Madison. He was not in Congress when the standing army was created, and the alien and sedition laws were passed, and if he had been, he could not have voted for them, and would not if he could. It was not in his nature to be a violent or proscriptive partizan, but he had given a firm support to the Republican administrations of Jefferson, Madison and Monroe. He hoped the Senator from Virginia was answered—he was sure the Senate must be wearied with this frivolous and unprofitable squabble."

You observe here how totally different the complexion of the reply is. He stands not committed in any way as to being a friend of the Administration of John Adams—neither does he tell you that he was not. You may come to any conclusion on this point, that you may see fit; and stand somewhat justified by the remarks themselves. His object appears to be to make it appear that neutrality was his best position; and while policy might have forced him to it in 1800, why should he in 1826, be afraid to avow his position? He was not, sir. He did avow it; but in 1840, after fourteen years had elapsed, without the discussion, as reported in the Congressional debates, being in the slightest degree brought in question—and when this Tippecanoe Text Book is published, you have a version of this discussion to suit every party. By it, you can place him in the Federal or Democratic ranks, as policy or necessity may require. It is even made to appear that John Randolph charged him with voting for the Standing Army, and the Alien and Sedition Laws. We here in Virginia, know the tenacity of that great man's memory too well, to suppose that he did not know that as a delegate from a Territory, Gen. Harrison had no vote. He tells you, "he was not in Congress, when the Standing Army was created, and the Alien and Sedition Laws were passed, and if he had been, he could not have voted for them, and would not, if he could." No, sir, he was not in Congress. He got his appointment as Secretary and Acting Governor of the North-western Territory, shortly after he resigned his commission in the army.—The act giving him his appointment—the Alien Law, the Sedition Law, and the law for the Provisional Army, were all approved by Jno. Adams in 1798, in the same month. He succeeded a man by the name of Steele, who is thus represented by Mr. Jefferson, in vol. 4, p. 508 of his Writings: "Steele was a Counselor of Virginia, and was voted out by the Assembly, because he turned Tory. He then offered for Congress, and was rejected by the people. Then offered for the Senate of Virginia, and was rejected."—Mr. H. succeeded this man in getting his office from a President, whose rule of appointment, as avowed in the debate in 1798, on the Foreign Intercourse Bill, (by Sitgreaves, Harper and Smith,) was appointments exclusively from those agreeing in political opinions. Yes, sir, getting it from an Administration of which Mr. Jefferson said, (in his letter to New Haven, volume 3, page 475, of his writings,) "Those who were not of a particular sect of politics, were excluded from all office." He retained this office, I believe till 1800, when he received the appointment from the same hand, of Governor of the Territory of Indiana; a territory the establishment of which, he was the first to propose. But, Mr. President, if he was not in Congress when the standing army was created in 1797, where was he in 1800, when our own legislature instructed her Senators to "procure a reduction of this very army within the narrowest limits compatible with the protection of the forts, and the preservation of the arsenals, maintained by the U. States, unless such a measure shall be forbidden by information not known to the public?" I ask emphatically, where was he then? At this very time, when our legislature were framing their remonstrance, the Republican party in Congress, were battling with the Federalists, to get this reduction? Mr. Harrison though he had no vote, took the floor in defence of the Federal administration, and against a reduction of the army. Yes, sir, this was his position, though he has the audacity now to tell us, in this late version of his speech, that "standing as he did the sole representative of that territory, his greatest ambition was to prove himself faithful to his trust, by cherishing its interests, and nothing could be more suicidal or pernicious to those he represented, than for him to exasperate either party by becoming a violent partizan, without the power of aiding either party, because he had no vote on any political question"—to tell us also—"He was not in Congress when the Standing Army was created and the Alien and Sedition laws were passed; and if he had been, he could not have voted for them, and would not if he could." Sir, what downright effrontery is this? He tells us he would not have voted for the Standing Army created in 1797, and which was increased in 1798, and yet in 1800, he speaks against a reduction of this very Army, at this most convulsed period of our country, the "Reign of Terror," as it was

styled, when our own State built her own armory to arm and provide her people against the dangers which menaced them, not from a foreign enemy, but from the minions of Federalism at home. Sir, he here stands convicted out of his own lips, of what? What shall I say, Mr. President? Must I adopt that rigor of the day, and use a harsh term in reference to this old man? No, Sir, I will forbear. I will only say, he stands contradicted by himself, out of his own very mouth.—This proven, as it indubitably is, how can we receive his denial in relation to his having worn the black cockade, particularly when the fact that he did so, is so clearly made out by the overwhelming testimony I have introduced? How can we receive his declaration as to what he would have done, had he been in Congress when the Alien and Sedition Laws were passed? It is clear he was not in Congress at the time; if he had been, he tells you he would not have voted for them, if he could. So he said, in relation to the army bill; but we see how he acted subsequently. Sir, the testimony of Mr. Fowler proves to you that he heard him sustain the Sedition Law, and under all the circumstances of the case—Weighing particularly the position of the gentleman himself, as ascertained by his very acts and declarations, I ask you, and the members of this Association, what would have been the course of this gentleman, had he been called on to support the Alien and Sedition Laws—would he not have acted as he did on the Army bill, when brought to the test, and sustained the Reign of Terror?—Now, Sir, which horn of this dilemma will the Whig party or their Federalist nominee take? The version of this discussion, as reported by Gales & Seaton, which stamps him with the marks of those whose peculiarly chosen favorite he was, or the late version of this discussion, which, taken connectedly with the history of his course in the Senate of the U. S., stamps him, to use as mild language as the case will admit of, with quibbling and prevarication. Strange to say, Sir, this last version he has recently endorsed in a letter from North Bend, dated 2d June, 1840, addressed to Charles M. Thruston, Henry Pirtle and G. W. Anderson, and which is in these words:

"Gentlemen: In answer to your enquiry, 'Whether the letters and speeches which have been published in my name, by my political friends, particularly those contained in a pamphlet lately published in Cincinnati, by Col. C. L. Todd and Benj. Drake, Esq., contain the sentiments and opinions which I at present entertain.' I repeat what I have lately written to a committee of my friends in New York—that I should not consider myself an honest man, to suffer those letters and speeches to be thus used, without contradiction, if any alterations had taken place in my opinions."

"I am, very respectfully,

"Your fellow-citizen,

"WM. H. HARRISON."

Some have gone so far as to charge General Harrison, by the approval of this new version of this discussion, with having endorsed a forgery. It is very clear he has endorsed it, but I cannot believe that he would endorse anything, knowing it to be false; and it is most likely, that the publication referred to in his letter is the same alluded to in the notable document of Messrs. Gwynne, Wright and Spencer, of the 29th of February last. They say in a postscript, "The committee are now publishing in a pamphlet form many of the former expressed opinions of the General, and facts and incidents connected with his past life, which will be forwarded you at an early moment." Perhaps as this compilation was made by the old gentleman's sponsors, he took it for granted it was all right, or (to use an expression of modern parlance) O. K.; and therefore, without reading, endorsed it. I will not, or do not, charge these gentlemen with forgery, but will merely say something is somewhere "rotten in Denmark."—It is evident he is in a most irreconcilable position in regard to the matter—and whichever horn of the dilemma himself or friends may elect, certainly neither will be enviable. In his letter to Mr. Lyons, dated 1st June, 1840, he alludes to this discussion, not in a way to deprive it of any of its force. He says:

"If the charge made against me, by Mr. Randolph, is authentic, taken from a newspaper report, surely my answer to him should be considered so also." I am perfectly willing it should stand on this footing.—Mr. H. proceeds, "The truth is, that I believe he really regretted his attack upon me. He repeatedly told me so, and frequently solicited me to bury the hatchet at a friendly dinner with him, which I agreed to do." This was, Mr. President, an admirable moment to bury the hatchet; but by that, it was not meant, I presume, to obliterate the acts of the past, or to make Mr. Randolph gainsay what he had said. He might have regretted having placed the gentleman in so unenviable a position; but, further than this, I cannot see how the reference made in this letter invalidates in any way the true effects of the discussion—and, indeed, I cannot understand the intended bearing of the reasoning in this letter, if it can be so called.—It is certainly, to my mind, neither analytical, synthetical or syllogistical—it, per-

* It is the same in this as in the Tippecanoe Text Book.

haps, may be intended as apologetical—One thing is very certain, that there is no place more apropos than the festive board to obliterate the little animosities and bickerings that may now and then arise. I, for one, am pleased that those gentlemen quaffed their wine together, to the forgetfulness of the bitter of the past.—I like to see friendship's chain brightened—and I should still more, Mr. President, like to see our political opponents, and their mighty Chief, brighten our understandings in relation to this discussion; and if they can prove from it, that Mr. H. is a Republican, their ideas and minds both are brighter than I take them to be.—Mr. H. a Republican? Why, Sir, it is preposterous.—Where did the political journals of 1800 place him? How does he stand registered in the Aurora, one of the leading Democratic papers of that day?—alongside of notorious Federalists, Otis, Ross, Pickering, Bayard, Dayton, Harper, &c. But, Sir, let us proceed to analyse some other bearings of this newly baptised Republican. In his letter to the Inquirer, (a paper published in Cincinnati,) dated 17th September, 1822, he says:

"I deem myself a Republican of what is commonly called the old Jeffersonian School, and believe in the correctness of that interpretation of the Constitution which has been given by the writings of that enlightened statesman, who was at the head of the party and others belonging to it, particularly the celebrated resolutions of the Virginia Legislature, during the Presidency of Mr. Adams."

Here, indeed, he stands out in bold relief, by profession, as occupying Republican ground. But how does he stand in 1833, 11 years afterwards, as to be found in his Fourth July Speech, at Cheviot, Ohio? Hear him:

"I have thus, fellow-citizens, endeavored to explain to you the principles upon which the Government of our Union is formed. I recommend to you, however, the Proclamation of the President of the United States, issued on the 10th December last, and the speeches of Mr. Webster, delivered in the Senate of the U. S., at their last session of Congress, in answer to the arguments of Mr. Calhoun, as containing the most eloquent and satisfactory exposition of those principles (of the Government) of the Union, that have recently been published." By this act, in his opinion, Gen. Jackson done more for his country, than by "his splendid victory at N. Orleans."

He is, sir, the bold and open defender of President Jackson's celebrated Proclamation—that instrument which caused many to leave his Administration, in consequence of its high-toned Federalism—the doctrines of which, President Jackson, himself, recanted, shortly after their announcement. Yes, sir, Mr. Harrison not only it appears sanctioned them out and out, but goes a bow-shot further, by recommending "the speeches of Mr. Webster, delivered in the Senate of the U. States, at their last session of Congress, in answer to the arguments of Mr. Calhoun, as containing the most eloquent and satisfactory exposition of those principles (of the Government) of the Union, that have recently been published." By this act, in his opinion, Gen. Jackson done more for his country, than by "his splendid victory at N. Orleans." Mr. President, how can you help exclaiming, "what a Republican this man is?" Yes, sir, of the "Old Jeffersonian School," moving perfectly in accordance with "the celebrated Resolutions of the Virginia Legislature of 1798"—lauding Daniel Webster to the skies as the best expounder of the Constitution—the notorious leader of the Federal party of the present day—a man who glories in his Federalism—yet Mr. H. is a Republican! Is he not a walking and living monument of the true Democratic faith? *Nil admirari!* But, Sir, let us come down to a later period—to December, 1839. Who stood forth at Harrisburg, as the great champion of the Harrison nomination? Who heralded forth his claims? In whose speech are his praises sung? Whose sentiments have been echoed and re-echoed throughout the Union in the papers of the Whig party? Judge Jacob Burnett of Ohio, is the answer to these interrogatories. And who is this man, Mr. President? You shall learn, and from his own letter. It is taken from a book recently published by the Philosophical and Historical Society of Ohio, vol. 1, page 106-7.

"Dear Sir: Though I am not disposed to say much, nor indeed, 'any thing, of myself, further than is necessary, in stating the transactions in which I participated, yet I am unwilling to conceal the fact, that, I was, and always have been a Federalist. Educated in that school, * * * I retain and cherish the name, as descriptive of the purest Republican patriots, the country has ever produced."

"JACOB BURNETT."

To J. Delafield, jr.
The great champion of the Harrison nomination, is an avowed Federalist, a man who prides himself upon being so, and who says, "I retain and cherish the name, as descriptive of the purest Republican patriots the country has ever produced." Why, Sir, we begin, I believe, to see into the matter. From this high authority, it appears that the Federalists are in their own estimation Republicans—ergo, Mr. H. must be a Republican. Sir, I hope by this time we are enabled to come to the conclusion, that this Mr. Harrison is not what we would call a Democratic Republican.

U. S. Bank.

How stands the gentleman in relation to a BANK OF THE U. S. in 1819, when he was a candidate in Ohio for the State Senate? I quote, Sir, from Niles' Register, editorial, vol. 17, page 131:

In 1819, Gen. Harrison was a candidate in Ohio for the State Senate. "Certain resolutions were passed at a meeting of the people, disapprobatory of him because he was a director in the

Branch located there; and in consequence, he has published a long address in the newspapers. He declares himself the enemy of Banking in general, and especially of the Bank of the U. S. That he has very little personal interest in any of them, and was formerly opposed to the establishment and continuance of the said Bank of the U. States—that he views it as an institution 'which may be converted into an immense political engine to strengthen the arm of the General Government, and which may at some future day be used to oppress and break down the State Governments,' &c."

Here, Sir, he declares himself not only the enemy of the United States Bank, but of Banks in general—was uniformly opposed to a Bank of the United States—that "it may be converted into an immense political engine, to strengthen the arm of the General Government, and which may at some future day be used to oppress and break down the State Governments."—What language could be more strong or more emphatic? The most ultra anti-Bank man could not go further. Equally strong is he as to the unconstitutionality of a Bank of the United States. In his letter to the Inquirer, to which I have before referred, written in 1822, he says: "I believe that the charter given to the Bank of the United States was unconstitutional—it being not one of those measures necessary to carry any of the expressly granted powers into effect."—All this is certainly, Mr. President, clear and strong. What could be more so? But clear and strong as it is against a Bank of the United States, in every possible aspect—aye, and against all Banks, how do we find this gentleman 14 years afterwards, in his letter to Sherrod Williams, dated 1st May, 1836?

"I have made this statement to show you, that I am not committed to any course in relation to a chartering of a bank of the United States; and that I might, if so disposed, join in the popular cry of denunciation against the old institution; and upon its misconduct, predicate an opposition to the chartering of another."

"The question, then, for me to answer, is whether, under the circumstances you state, if elected to the office of President, I would sign an act to charter another bank. I answer, I would, if it were clearly ascertained that the public interest in relation to the collection and disbursement of the revenue would materially suffer without one, and there were unequivocal manifestations of public opinion in its favor. I think, however, the experiment should be fairly tried, to ascertain whether the financial operations of the government cannot be as well carried on without the aid of a national bank. If it is not necessary for that purpose, it does not appear to me that one can be constitutionally chartered. There is no construction which I can give the Constitution which would authorize it, on the ground of affording facilities to commerce."

Mr. President, are you not startled? Are you not asking yourself can this be true? He here unequivocally asserts, "that I am not committed to any course in relation to the chartering of a Bank of the U. S."—that it ought first to be ascertained "whether the financial operations of the Government cannot be as well carried on without the aid of a National Bank. If it is not necessary for that purpose, it does not appear to me that one can be constitutionally chartered." But does he not say in 1819, that it is "unconstitutional, it being not one of those measures necessary to carry any one of the expressly granted powers into effect." Sir, in how ridiculous an attitude is this man placed, and in what attitude in relation to this very subject are his Whig friends in the different portions of the Union? In Kentucky, in this very city, and Alabama, he is sustained as being for a Bank; while even in the county of Amelia, (as stated here by our friend, Col. Jeter, of that county, the other evening,) and in Indiana, and by the organs of the Whig party in this State, (at least by the Address of the Whig Convention held in this city,) he is sustained as being against a Bank. What says the address:—

"His unqualified declaration is before you, that a Bank is unconstitutional." Ex-Senator Rives, since he has commenced his crusade, has sustained him as being against a Bank. This is certainly a most plant system to electioneer upon; for, it is only necessary to ascertain the political pulse of the party to be operated on, to administer a dose, by authority too, by referring to the documents, to prove that this redoubtable nominee is either for or against a Bank. But, Sir, you will observe that he says in his letter to Sherrod Williams, "I think, however, the experiment should be fairly tried to ascertain whether the financial operations of the Government cannot be as well carried on without the aid of a National Bank." From this language the hope could be indulged, that the experiment now making, the only practicable resort, would at least receive the favorable consideration of Mr. Harrison: but not so, Sir; for, he tells us in his late speech at Fort Meigs, delivered 25th June last—"The passage of the Sub-Treasury bill will give to the President an accumulation of power—the single additional power that the Constitution withholds from him, and the possession of which will make him in a Monarch. This catastrophe to freedom should be, and can be, prevented by vigilance, union and perseverance." His opinion then is unequivocal, and decidedly in opposition to this scheme, notwithstanding in 1836 he thought that "the experiment should be fairly tried," &c., but while he considers the Treasury bill as giving "the President an accumulation of power," how do his political supporters stand in relation to it? In Congress in 1834, when the Pet Bank scheme, as it was termed, was the bantling of the Administration in power, it was assailed with that violence which usually characterises an opposition: Wm. F. Gordon, then in the Whig ranks, and a member from the Albemarle district, brought in a bill organizing the Sub-Treasury system as a sub-

stitute for the plan of the Administration. Here was its first inception; the bill was voted down, and it was thought at the time that it met its defeat—more from the framing of the bill itself than from the principle it contained; hence Mr. John Robertson, the member from this district, who was then and is now a Whig, moved to recommit to the Committee of Ways and Means the Deposit bill, with instructions to bring in one dispensing with the Banks in the fiscal administration of the Government; and who voted for this proposition?—all the Whigs in the H. of Representatives, 91 in number, and 1 Democrat. Here are the names of the Whigs:

Yeas—Messrs. J. Q. Adams, A. Allen, J. J. Allen, Chilton Allen, Archer, Ashley, John Banks, Barber, Barnitz, Barrington, Bates, John Bell, Bayliss, Beal, Beatty, Binney, Briggs, Burgess, Campbell, Chambers, Chilton, Claiborne, Clark, Clayton, Thomas Corwin, Crane, Crockett, Darlington, Davis, Davenport, Deberry, Denny, Dickson, Evans, Everett, Ewing, Fillmore, Foster, Gambell, Geo. Grennell, Jr., Griffin, Hall, Harding, Harper, Hazletine, Heath, Hester, W. Jackson, E. Jackson, James, Johnson, Jones, Letcher, Lewis, Lincoln, Love, Martindale, Marshall, McKinnis, McKennan, Mercer, Miller, Minor, S. M. Moore, Phillips, Pickens, Potts, Jr., J. Reed, Robertson, W. B. Shepard, Slade, Spangler, Steel, Taylor, Tompkins, Trumbull, Twedy, Vance, Vinton, Watmough, Wilde, L. J. Williams, E. C. Wilson, Wise, Young.

What said Mr. B. W. Leigh, one of the most violent of the Whig party, then known? Hear him from his letter published in the Richmond Enquirer, 26th Sept. 1834, in reply to a committee of his friends:

"My judgment, indeed, is also opposed to that broad system of implication, by which the power to charter a National Bank, and many other powers, have been derived to the Federal Legislature, and recently to the Federal Executive; which latter has advanced and acted upon a doctrine of implied powers, far more intudious than was ever before heard of. In my opinion, the framers of the Constitution had no thought of any bank agency whatever, State or Federal, either for facilitating the operations of the Treasury, or for regulating the currency; and that to administer the Government in the true spirit of the Constitution, and according to the intention of its founders, the Treasury ought to be divorced from all connexion with banks, State or Federal."

This is certainly, Mr. President, most clear, most unequivocal language: it was never contemplated in the opinion of this learned gentleman, that the Constitution was to confer "the power to charter a National Bank," that "the Treasury ought to be divorced from all connexion with banks, State or Federal." This was, mark you, Mr. President, in 1834, before the meeting of the legislature; it was the period of a most intense excitement, caused by the removal of the deposits. The financial concerns of the country generally, was the vital topic of the day. Mr. Leigh had expressed his opinions upon the divorce of the Government from all banks, in the strong language I have mentioned. Still, sir, in a few months after, he was elected to the Senate of the U. S. by a Whig legislature; but, what is the language of this gentleman subsequently, as to be found in his speech, delivered in Petersburg, 15th Oct. 1836:

"As to the place of deposit of the public treasure of the United States, and the distribution and disbursement of it, Mr. Leigh had recently intimated in his opinion, that the true principles of the Constitution, according to the intention of its framers, would require that the Treasury would be divorced from all connection with any Bank or Banks, State or Federal. The same proposition had been suggested by Mr. Gordon, at the last session of Congress, and the hint of it in truth was given by Mr. Jefferson, in a letter to Mr. Gallatin in 1803. A regulation of the Treasury, on that principle, was simple enough. Let a General Treasury Office be established at the seat of Government, under the management of a Treasurer, and local Treasury offices established in each of the States, (as many as should be convenient,) under the management of Assistant Treasurers, requiring bond and security from the Treasurer and Assistant Treasurers for the faithful performance of their trust. Let the public revenue be deposited in these offices as it should be collected. Give power to the Secretary of the Treasury to remove redundant funds from one office to another, where convenience should require them to be disbursed. Give power to the Treasurer to draw warrants on any office he should think proper, guarding the power by suitable and sufficient checks; make it embezzlement and felony in him, wilfully to issue any warrant, except under authority of law, at the bidding of any person whatever, and make it embezzlement and felony in any Assistant Treasurer to use for his own purpose, lend to others, or pay away any money, except to warrants drawn by the Treasurer under due form of law."

"Mr. Leigh said he had no hopes that it would be adopted; because the friends of the State Banks, the friends of a National Bank, the friends of Executive claims to power over the Treasury, would all be opposed to it." "And because the nation would not be content to give up the profits of the sum paid in for revenue, as active capital, in the interval between the collection and disbursement, and to let it lie idle and unproductive; and he might have added, that the expense of such an establishment would be as strenuously urged against it, as if Congress were not disposing of surplus revenue to the tune of millions at every session. But the Jacksonite objection to it, was an argumentum ad hominem to him, (Mr. L.), viz: that the scheme would give the custody of the public treasure to the President, which as these objections intimated, was the very thing that he affected to hold in such dread and aversion. But the obvious effect of the scheme would be to take the public treasure out of the custody and control of the President."

Could the Independent Treasury bill have a warmer, a more staunch advocate? "That the true principles of the Constitution, according to the intention of its framers," would require that the Treasury should be divorced from all "connection with any bank, State or Federal." "BUT THE OBVIOUS EFFECT OF THE SCHEME would be, to take the treasure out of the custody and control of the President." "He had no hopes that it would be adopted, because the friends of the State Banks, the friends of a National Bank, the friends of Executive claims to power over the Treasury, would all be opposed to it."

Where do we find that chaste and consistent journal, the Richmond Whig? The Senior Editor of it, not content with the power he could wield from the

Editorial desk, enters the arena in its advocacy and defense in a most elaborate article under his own name, "John Hampden Pleasants"—from which I quote. Hear him: "The Sub-Treasury Scheme, a mere child of legislation, which may be tried one year and discarded the next, and which, to try or not to try at all, does not infringe upon the Constitution—does not, unless by indirection, not of necessity, touch those radical questions either of principle or an honest, practical administration of the Government, which, as they are favorably or unfavorably resolved, determine the problem of our experiment in free government."—This, Sir, is indeed quite complimentary to the measure, and tells with great force in one important particular—that is, its not being a measure obnoxious to the Constitution, which, to try or not to try at all, does not infringe upon it.

Mr. President, Mr. H. stands now arrayed against himself upon this experiment, as he is, by the way, upon almost all things upon which he has expressed opinions. He stands arrayed against Mr. Leigh; against the great mouth-piece of the party—nay, Sir, against the whole party, when the measure was one of their own proposing. But now, Sir, when this very scheme is carried out, and adopted by the Republican party, all the value inherent in it, all the beauties it possessed, have changed to blighting and desolating consequences; to hideous deformity. When a Whig measure, "the effect of the scheme would be to take the public treasure out of the custody and control of the President." Now, it is to strengthen the Executive arm, to make it almost omnipotent.—Then, it could not be passed, because "the friends of Executive claims to power over the Treasury" would "be opposed to it; Now it is passed," thereby shewing that the Executive claims to power (if they did exist) are relaxed, the President is accused of carrying it by a spirit of Executive dictation, simply because, in accordance with the Constitution, which he has sworn to support, and which says, "He shall from time to time give to the Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient." Yes, Sir, simply because he has discharged this duty. What else was he to do? What else could he do? A Bank of the United States was out of the question. He was elected as the known and avowed constitutional opponent of such an institution. The State Banks had suspended specie payments, largely indebted to the Government. He could not, of course, look to them; he naturally looked to that measure which had been in agitation some years before, not by his friends, but by his opponents; a measure which Mr. Leigh tells you Mr. Jefferson was the first to suggest, in a letter to Mr. Gallatin in 1803. It was proposed in 1837.—Then, and at each session of Congress since, the President has alluded to it in his messages, in a tone calm and conciliating, and in a manner profound and argumentative, always manifesting the greatest deference to the opinions of the representatives of the people.—These representatives pass it, reflecting, no doubt, the will of their constituents; yet its passage is now gravely said to have proceeded from Executive dictation. Sir, has more time elapsed since its inception, considering the great importance of the measure itself, than was absolutely necessary to enable the people of this vast Union to examine, reflect and decide upon it? Consider, too, that the Representatives in Congress are not exactly reached every year, by appearing before their constituency for re-election—it takes several years before what might be termed a cycle of elections can be perfected; and it is but fair to presume that not a greater period has elapsed between the inception and passage of this bill than was absolutely necessary to enable the people to decide upon it. For myself, Sir, I believe, that, could their opinions be fully ascertained, the bill would have passed by a much larger majority. Sir, what financial measure is Mr. Harrison for? He is for and against every thing. But what would he or will he most likely do, if elected President? Ask his political friends—they cannot tell you, except, like Daniel Webster, by saying they want "Change, change, change." Say to them, do tell me what measures your candidate will support, if elected—they say your party have had the control of matters long enough; it is time they should give up, and conclude most likely by inviting you to come down to the Log Cabin to partake of a gourd of hard cider. It is not to be wondered at, that they cannot tell what measures their nominee will support. I am not surprised, because he will not tell them—consequently they cannot inform us; but, Sir, I am truly, truly surprised they should allow themselves to be thus paltered with by this superannuated old gentleman. Notwithstanding his tortuous course.—Notwithstanding his supporters are sustaining him as being both for and against a Bank of the U. S.—notwithstanding some of his most staunch adherents South—a few State Rights Whigs—are and ever will be opposed to such a Bank, at least under the present Constitution; yet, Sir, it is clear to my mind, that elect Mr. H. President to-morrow, he would sign a bill for the chartering of a Bank of the United States. When we reflect upon the materials composing his party generally—the position they

have occupied before the country from the period of President Jackson's veto of the bill re-chartering a Bank to the present moment—their uniform and consistent advocacy of such a measure—their hostility to the late Administration upon this very subject—all these things concur to prove that Mr. H. would consider his election as an evidence that his party expected this from him, and a bill he would sign, if required. His letter to Sherrod Williams is enough. His denunciation of the Independent Treasury—his doctrines on the veto power, to which I will presently refer—all these he would point to as furnishing an expose of his opinions, and in connection with his election would endeavor to justify himself before the country. Sir, a United States Bank I verily believe is considered by our opponents generally as the grand panacea, to the want of which, all the embarrassment of the country is to be attributed. From the rising of the sun to the going down thereof, the changes have been by them rung against the past and present Administrations, because the former crushed, and the latter will not revive a National Bank, both preferring the triumph of the Constitution, to the existence of an Herculean power; a strong adjunct to the Executive arm, had their design been might as it was not, but, right—an institution to use the apropos and forcible language of Mr. Harrison in 1819, "Which may be converted into an immense political engine, to strengthen the arm of the General Government, and which may at some future time be used to oppress and break down the State Governments."

(To be continued in our next.)

MR. TAZEWELL.—It gives us pleasure to perceive the State Rights men—who, as we believe, under a misconception of Gen. Jackson's real views, revolted at his policy—conquering their prejudices, and giving it their hearty support, as understood and carried out by Mr. Van Buren.

Mr. Van Buren has sustained the scrutiny of the most vigorous, acute minds in the Republic, rendered peculiarly jealous of the executive power in a President, by principle, habit, and position. His thoroughly Republican course in reconciling the authority of the General Government to the strictest construction of the State Rights doctrine, has reconciled to him the keen sighted, experienced, profound sagacity of Calhoun, Tazewell, and McDuffie, and disarmed all their prejudices against him.

These exalted men have nothing to expect from Mr. Van Buren. Mr. Tazewell and Mr. McDuffie have withdrawn from public life. Mr. Calhoun came in to his support when it was proclaimed that he was surrounded with disaster. Nothing but a conviction of the thorough Republicanism of the President, according to the strictest sect of the Jeffersonian school, could ever have brought such men to the side of the President. And yet Webster and his friends call him a tory! Harrison pronounces him a monarch!! And these gentlemen of the Black Cockade and Hartford Convention school dub themselves Whigs, upon the same principle, we suppose, that they convert bank palaces into log cabins, and whiskey into hard cider.—Globe.

Letter of the Hon. L. W. Tazewell.

NORFOLK, Aug. 23, 1840.

Sir: Your letter of yesterday was handed me when it was too late for me to reply to it by the servant who bore it. After the very explicit and often repeated declarations made by me to the committee of which you were a member, that I would not take any part in the ferocious contest now raging throughout the country, further than by giving my vote on the day of election, I did not expect to be called upon again to abandon this purpose, especially by one of the members of that committee. You misunderstand the reasons which induced me to form this resolution, if you suppose it can be changed either by repeating to me the unmerited commendations of too partial friends, or the infamous and malignant falsehoods of those whom I despise too much to call them foes.

I have no reason to believe that I could influence a single vote, any where, if I would; and I am very sure that I would not if I could. My opinions upon any subject, when regarded as of sufficient consequence to be sought for by any of my acquaintance, have never been withheld from them; nor will they ever be concealed from any one. These opinions, in regard to the respective merits of the two candidates for the Presidential office, were given to the members of your committee, when asked for by them, as they had been before given to several other persons, of both parties, and as they have been repeated to such persons since. I obtrude them upon none; but I am as indifferent who may know them, as I am by whom they may be approved. They are my opinions, and would continue to be such, although no other being on earth might concur with me.

Upon these opinions, as I formerly said to you, I shall act at the approaching election, by giving my suffrage in favor of the present President, and of consequence against his opponent. I have an acquaintance of some standing with both the candidates, founded upon a service with each of them for several successive years in the Senate of the United States. This acquaintance

justifies me in saying of each, that he is a well-bred gentleman, of mild and amiable manners and deportment, and so far as I either know or believe, of irreproachable private character. Gen. Harrison, is my senior by several years, I know, and therefore, he cannot be much short of seventy; Mr. Van Buren is my junior by more years, I believe, than Gen. Harrison is my senior. In their political course, these gentlemen have generally differed; and, while we were all associated as members of the Senate of the U. S., it was my fortune to differ sometimes with both. The occasions of my difference with Mr. Van Buren, were few and rare; but, with Gen. Harrison, I do not remember a single subject, involving any question of constitutional law, or of high political expediency, as to which we ever concurred.—And on the few occasions in which I differed with Mr. Van Buren, he was associated with Gen. Harrison.—Hence, it cannot be matter of surprise to any, that when placed in a situation where I am to choose between two persons, with neither of whom I have often united in opinion and action, to him with whom I have invariably differed.

I state these things, that knowing the effect which is sometimes produced upon human minds by frequent and long-continued conflicts of opinion upon subjects of much interest, you may appreciate as you please the sentiment I have often uttered, and will, therefore, again repeat, that, in my judgment, Gen. Harrison is both physically and intellectually incompetent to perform the many, varied, arduous, and important duties which must devolve upon every President of the U. States—that it is not prudent to expose our country to the certain perils which must await it, should its destinies ever be committed to a President by accident, in times of difficulty and high excitement; and that such a catastrophe is always probable, when one is elevated to the Presidential chair who has already reached the full term ordinarily considered as the limit of man's life.

To a kind letter from friends in a distant State, inquiring what were my opinions of Mr. Van Buren's administration, I have recently replied. A copy of this reply is now before me; and as it truly represents my sentiments upon this subject, I will transcribe my answer to the inquiry propounded. "I was opposed to Mr. Van Buren when he was first a candidate for the Vice Presidential chair, and my opposition to him was continued when he was afterwards a candidate for the station he now holds. Upon each of these occasions, there were other candidates who, as I thought, agreed with my opinions more exactly, and who, therefore, I preferred. Entertaining such sentiments, I have watched his course, since he came into power, with a vigilance that might not perhaps have been used by me under other circumstances. Yet, with all this vigilance, I have not been able to detect a single unconstitutional act that has been done or proposed by him, during his administration. This is not a slight merit, at least in my eyes; and when I connect with it that the whole scheme, of his policy, in regard to all our relations, whether foreign or domestic, has evinced much sagacity, prudence, and forbearance, and this, too, under circumstances of great difficulty, I cannot withhold my approbation from such a course.

"These are not the sentiments of one who has any claim, or even pretension, to be considered as a friend of the present President. They are the result of a careful examination into all his public acts, since he has occupied his present station—an examination made with as much candor and impartiality as I could command. This examination was commenced, I own, with no expectation that it would end in such a result. But it has so terminated; and common justice, as well as common honesty, compel me to award him a verdict, in my judgment, he has so well deserved. The support he has thus fairly earned, I will willingly give him, so long as he shall continue to merit it. Nor will I concur in the attempt to remove any tried servant, who, as I think, has deserved well of his country."

And now, sir, having satisfied all your inquiries, to the end that I may not be compelled to undergo the same labor again, I commit this letter to you, to be used as you may think proper.

I am, sir, respectfully,

Your most obedient servant,

LITTLETON W. TAZEWELL.

Dr. J. P. Young, Portsmouth, Va.

An Interesting Document.

The last Globe contains an "Address to the People of the Slaveholding States, by the Democratic Republican members of Congress from those States"—signed by Wm. R. King, Chairman—and the following members from each of those States on behalf of their Republican delegations, viz: C. C. Clay, of Ala.—R. C. Nicholas of La.—Wm. S. Fulton of Ark.—Francis Thomas of Md.—Geo. C. Dromgoole of Va.—J. J. McKay of N. C.—Felix Grundy of Tenn.—Wilson Lumpkin of Ga.—John Jameson of Mo.—Lynn Boyd of Ky.—A. G. Brown of Miss.—and T. D. Sumter of S. C. It occupies nearly 7 columns—and is followed by an appendix of documentary proofs, of 4 and a half columns more.

We shall lay it before our readers in the course of the next week. It is a dark and startling view of the acts and movements of the Northern Whigs, and of the intimate union between them and the Abolitionists, in regard to the Presidential Election. The Globe introduces the Report with the following impressive remarks:

"SOUTHERN ADDRESS.—We invoke the particular attention of every friend of the Union, North and South, to the Address of the Southern Democrats in Congress to the people of the slaveholding States, inserted in this day's paper.

"No man who has capacity to understand facts, can rise from its perusal, without a conviction that, to all practical intents, the Northern Whigs in Congress and out, are practically the allies of the Abolitionists, and rely upon them to get possession of both the State and General Governments. And their support has to be purchased; and the price is a sacrifice of the constitutional rights of the South! The necessary effects of such a coalition are exhibited in lines of light in the legislative and executive proceedings of the State of New York. THE GOVERNOR REFUSES TO DELIVER UP FOR TRIAL THE THIEVES WHO STEAL SLAVES FROM VIRGINIA, and the Legislature passes a law to prevent the recovery of the stolen property by its owners. Abolitionists have but to send clowns to hover on the Southern coast, steal all the slaves they can, and carry them to New York, where they will be hailed and protected, both themselves and property, by a Whig Governor and Whig authorities.

"And what is to be the condition of Maryland and Virginia, Kentucky and Missouri, when this slave-stealing spirit shall, by the same combination now struggling for ascendancy, control the Legislatures and Governors of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana and Illinois? We need not answer that question; it is answered by the example of New York.

"Was not General Harrison nominated by precisely such a combination of Whigs and Abolitionists as elected Governor Secord, and now controls the Government of New York? And if elected, must not the same or similar concessions be made to the spirit of Abolition, to maintain the ascendancy of his party? He who does not believe so, must close his eyes to the lightning's brightness, and stop his ears to the rolling thunder.

"Yet there are Southern Whigs who wink at these overwhelming facts, and endeavor to draw off the attention of the Southern people from the real danger, by misrepresenting the action of the President upon the proceedings of a petty court martial, where a couple of negroes were permitted by Southern officers to give a little immaterial testimony!"

And will nothing rouse the Southern Whigs to a sense of their duties to the South? Does it not startle them to find themselves associated in such company? to find their candidate declaring but the other day in his Greenville Speech, that he would not veto any bill passed by Congress, (upon Abolition or upon a Bank, it matters not)?—He goes to strike the whole Veto power from the Constitution, upon the exercise of which by Gen. Washington, Mr. Jefferson himself once congratulated his Republican friends? But will the Southern People follow their Whig leaders in their infatuated support of Gen. Harrison? Will they assist in driving from the Administration the very man, who stands solemnly pledged to reject any bill which may touch the subject of slavery and trench upon the sacred rights of the South? The following letter from an able Republican, north of the Hudson, rings some warnings in our ears, which no wise man in the South is at liberty to disregard. For once, we ask the Whigs to quell their phrenzied feelings, and listen to the still small voice of common sense:

"Federalism, in its worst form, is abroad among us, and what is worse, is counting with great confidence on Virginia. The Old Dominion, they claim, has abandoned her principles, apostatized from her faith, and become a convert to Massachusetts and her creed. Under the tutelage of the Hon. Mr. Botts, and Wm. C. Rives, Virginia has mounted the stool of repentance, and humbled her pride to Webster and Harrison! I need not say to you, that I am yet a skeptic—that I yet, in spite of all her faults, have faith in Old Virginia, and that the Democracy of the North look to her to elevate her own glorious standard, and be foremost in this mighty and unequalled contest.—The unfortunate result of your last Spring election, and that of some preceding elections in Virginia, and farther South, have operated disastrously in some sections North. It is claimed, that the South is not true to herself, on questions that affect her most; and as a proof of it, we are told that the Abolitionists have made a Presidential nomination, which Virginia, in her State election, sanctions; that Botts, and Truman Smith, and Wise, and Slade, are in one common brotherhood, uniting in the same cause, and for the same end. There is more truth than I wish there was, in these remarks; and they are not without their effect on some. The questions of slavery and freedom, in a free State, present themselves differently from what they can with you. If our friends have not permitted their sympathies for the slave to influence them, it has been, because they have been go-

verned by what they esteem obligations. But these obligations, your Tyler sigh, your Botts and Wise, and Wm. C. Rives, anoving, and leaving your Northern allies without principal. For, let our Northern Federalists and Abolitionists succeed in inducing the South to vote for him, and you paralyze to some extent, the arm of the tongue that has been nerved in your cause.

"On this question I never without finding myself hurried away by it. Tith, if they yield on this question, not only take all argument from, and abandon their friends in the States, but they will take a step that can never be traced. The internal and unhappy divisions at path, during the last four years, have done you a injury.

"We shall continue to look great earnestness to Virginia—to your Convention your movements—and to the grand result. I have permitted myself to doubt the integrity of the Omnipotent. God bless her for the good she has done likely to do."

Certain it is, that by electing Harrison, we must cheer and encourage all the Abolitionists, and throw a damper over many of friends to the North, who have hitherto risked so for the South.

RICHMOND, Va., WEDDAY, SEPT. 2.

"A wise and frugal Government shall restrain men from injuring one another; shall leave them free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and impropr and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government.—MR. JEFFERSON'S INAL ADDRESS.

Just and high-mindments.

Two Republicans of Virgin distant parts of the State, have recently expressed sentiments, on the great cause in which we enlisted. They have both full confidence in the undundings of the People—very different indeed from contempt which the Whigs have no hesitation in sing, in the humbugs that they are continually getting. The Republicans address the understandings byments and principles.—The Whigs attempt to gnd deceive them.

The first of these gentlemen Judge Henry St. G. Tucker, who was invited to a ic dinner in Wythe county, and declines in a letter which the following is an extract:

"Confined by my official duties to face, it would not be in my power to comply with the wishes fellow-citizens on this occasion, even if public sentiment did seem to require a forbearance on the part of the Judges, the exciting scenes of political controversy.—But though I cibe with you, I am at least free to feel and express as a citizen union of sentiment in your solicitude for the success of thocracy, in the present exciting political campaign. We cbe blind to the unexampled efforts which are making through the Union for the overthrow of the party to which we are led. We cannot be inattentive to the organized array of the talents of the Opposition for the purpose of carrying all them. We cannot but be conscious how large a portion of on profession and of the wealthy and commercial are arrayedst us. We cannot but feel that with these obstacles to ouess, we have much to fear, unless the public mind is disabst the innumerable errors which are scattered with unclous hand among the people. Let this be done, and the kind honest yeomanry of the country will flock as heretofore to standard which for many years they have so faithfully upheld, them is my trust, and from them I hope for victory.—and ev our adversaries would in the contest acquire the ascendancy no doubt that they are destined speedily to lose it. Thes of the Democracy cannot go backward. It may be arrested while, but its march is irresistible.

"I offer you the following sentiment the People of Virginia.—Unaccustomed to move at the com of any superior, they march straight forward while their fillers are wheeling."

The other is a distinguished orator on the upper James River, who writes as fol:

"They greatly mistake the ingence of the people who believe that they cannot stand, when plainly presented to them, even the moststruse questions of constitutional law, and the most difficult problems in finance and currency. If a sp or a writer understands the question well himsef will find but little difficulty in making himself, any subject understood to the mass of the people. Course is I think, a plain one—it is, to give to the ple as full a history as possible, of the opinions, the s, the political conduct of the two candidates, to e in the practical operations of the measures advocacy each, and to show as plainly as possible the differencies and interests by which they are respectively ported. Let this be done (and I believe it will be do and I have no doubt of the issue. Our opponents ansvuing a course directly opposite. The mass of ill have no doubt believe that the measures they adve will be best for the country, yet they seem to be vegrain that they cannot induce the people to think. Hence, although they have as much certainly, if greatly more, of the speaking talents of the country their side, they evidently shrink from the discussi the principles on which they would wish to see thovernment administered."

Mr. Clay in Nolle.

A great Whig Convention would in Nashville, on the 17th of August—and their teters boast of having 20,000 present. Among the guests, were Messrs. Clay and Crittenden. Mr. Clay course played the Orator in high style. "He prsed himself to be a Democrat"—and claimed to have learned his Democracy in the School of '38 and '39. But unfortunately, he has forgotten every thing the learned. In the

course of his speech, he made several allusions to "the illustrious captain in the neighborhood"—but could not refrain from shooting his poisoned arrows at the great man, although "he hoped he would live long and enjoy happiness, and when he departed from this fleeting vale of tears, that he would enter into the abode of the just made perfect."—But that illustrious man would not sit calmly by, and hear of his attack—and Mr. Clay has provoked one of the severest retorts, which could be compressed into so small a compass. We recommend General Jackson's Card to the especial attention of all such assailants.

But there is one passage in Mr. Clay's speech, which is so utterly disingenuous, that it is impossible to read it without feeling the indignant contempt, which it is calculated to provoke in every dispassionate mind: Yes, (exclaimed the Orator,) "General Harrison is a coward, but he fought more battles than any other General during the last war, and never sustained a defeat." It is idle for Mr. Clay to raise a phantom, that he might dissipate it; for, no man has pronounced Harrison a coward whose opinion is entitled to respect; but what shall we say of the extravagant compliment which Mr. Clay pays to Gen. Harrison? If the Gen. be such a hero, how comes it about that whilst the achievements of the last war were fresh in the recollection of Mr. Clay in March 1816, in that celebrated speech which Mr. Clay delivered, on the question "What have we gained by the War?" he names so many "illustrious captains"—he commemorates the glories of Jackson, Brown and Scott; the glories of Hull, and Lawrence and Perry on the waves—that he repeats the name of Jackson three times, whilst he does not even name Harrison once.—We published an Extract from that Speech on the 14th of August—and it shows how slightly Mr. C. then thought of Gen. H.—but now he has a party purpose to answer. He wants a Hero to serve his ends—and although he once disclaimed the election of a Military Chieftain as "worse than war, pestilence and famine," yet now he goes for a Military Chieftain—and General Harrison, whom he slurred over in 1816, is now the Hero; the most successful Hero of the war of 1812!

(From the Baltimore Republican.)

MR. CLAY—GENERAL JACKSON.

The first named individual, at the Whig gathering in Nashville, Tennessee, took occasion to let out a volume of abuse upon the "Old Hero," Patriot, and distinguished Statesman, Andrew Jackson. Among other vile slanders, he observed: "How could it be otherwise when the high places in Government were given to such men as Edward Livingston and Swartwout—the first a notorious defaulter, and the other the associate of Aaron Burr in his treasonable designs against the Union?"

"The 'Old Hero,' comes out with that boldness, which conscious truth and justice always inspire:

To the Editor of the Nashville Union:

SIR: Being informed that the Hon. Henry Clay of Kentucky, in his public speech at Nashville yesterday alleged that I had appointed the Hon. Edward Livingston Secretary of State when he was a defaulter and knowing him to be one, I feel that I am justified in declaring the charge to be false. It is known to all the country, that the nominations made by the President to the Senate, are referred to appropriate committees of that body, whose duty it is to inquire into the character of the nominees, and that if there is any evidence of default, or any disqualifying circumstance existing against them, a rejection of the nomination follows. Mr. Livingston was a member of the Senate from the State of Louisiana, when he was nominated by me. Can Mr. Clay say that he opposed the confirmation of his nomination, because he was a defaulter? If so, the journals of the Senate will answer. But his confirmation by the Senate is conclusive proof that no such objection, if made, was sustained, and I am satisfied that such a charge against him could not have been substantiated.

I am also informed, that Mr. Clay charged me with appointing Samuel Swartwout collector of the port of New York, knowing that he had been an associate of Aaron Burr. To this charge it is proper to say that I knew of Mr. Swartwout's connection with Aaron Burr, precisely as I did that of Mr. Clay himself, who, if the history of the times did not do him great injustice, was far from avoiding an association with Burr when he was at the town of Lexington in Kentucky. Yet Mr. Clay was appointed Secretary of State; and I may say confidently with recommendations for character and fitness not more favorable than those produced to me by the citizens of New York in behalf of Mr. Swartwout. Mr. Clay too at the time of his own appointment to that high office, it will be recollected, was directly charged throughout the Union with having bargained for it, and by none was this charge more earnestly made than by his present associates in Tennessee, Messrs. Bell and Foster.

Under such circumstances how contemptible does this demagogue appear, when he descends from his high place in the Senate and roams over the country, retailing slanders against the living and the dead.

ANDREW JACKSON.

Hermitage, Aug. 13th, 1840.

Mr. Watson's Speech.

This Speech, which occupies so much of our to-day's paper, and will be continued in our next and succeeding number, fills a greater space than either the Speaker or the Editor anticipated—but we pray our readers to peruse it carefully. It is an able and comprehensive paper. It takes the whole scope of the debate—discusses the principles of both parties—exposes the humbugs of the Whigs—and strips of all disguise the disingenuous subterfuges and the deficient qualifications of the Federal, Abolition candidate. It embraces almost all the facts of the case, and the strong arguments which bear upon the Election. Again, we say, read it.

Who will not also read the frank, manly, calm and lucid letter of L. W. Tazewell? Of almost all the distinguished citizens in this State, Mr. T. has the strongest prejudices against Mr. V. B.; but he has subdued them, like a patriot and a statesman—and he now declares openly, boldly for him. He pronounces Gen. H. to be "both physically and intellectually incompetent to perform the many, varied, arduous, and important duties which must devolve upon every President of the U. States."

Another striking sign!—We shall publish as soon as possible an able letter from Thomas B. Hoove, Esq., of Prince William, abandoning the Whigs. He has signed off from the Federalists—Let the following extract suffice for the present

"Whilst he (Mr. Van Buren) is thus encountering the mad spirit of the (Abolition) party, Gen. Harrison has meanly truckled to them, and courted their support at the expense of his character.—Not satisfied with silently permitting them to claim his nomination as an 'Anti-Slavery victory,' not satisfied with encouraging assurances, privately given to an Abolition Editor in his own State, he dispatches a private and confidential letter to George E. no, of Maine, holding out again encouraging assurances to the Abolitionists of the North, at the very moment he is distributing documents at the South, denouncing them and their frad-like schemes. Thus has he committed an act of deliberate duplicity, which, for the first time, dishonors a Presidential canvass."

SCENES IN GOOCHLAND.

GOOCHLAND, Aug. 21, 1840.

On Monday last, our able Representative in Congress, Mr. John W. Jones, addressed the people of this county, agreeably to a request of the Democratic meeting which was held at our July Court. Mr. Jones gave a lucid and faithful account of his stewardship, to the evident satisfaction of the assembled Democracy. He defended the constitutional Treasury at considerable length, and truly and emphatically asked, "who is there more competent to have an Independent Treasury than an INDEPENDENT PEOPLE?" He told the people that his personal observation in Congress had convinced him that the great body of the Opposition are now struggling for the establishment of a National Bank, their false professions in some parts of the country to the contrary notwithstanding; their leaders and members of Congress are wedded to such an institution; and a Bank will follow Gen. Mum's election, as surely and inevitably as the shadow follows the substance. I was particularly pleased with that part of Mr. Jones's speech wherein he lashed the bald, shameless and unprincipled inconsistency of the Federalists, in supporting candidates for President and Vice President whose respective opinions are diametrically different. Says he, "Fellow-citizens, we have lately seen the Whig motto of 'Tip, Tyler, and Tariff,' blazoned forth at their public meetings, and this motto reminds me of the sublime harmony which is apparent between the opinions of the two candidates. Old Tip is so wedded to the Tariff, that he had made use of that bold figure about the grass growing in the streets of Norfolk and Charleston—yet, Tyler is against a Tariff. Old Tip will sign a Bank bill if elected President, although he has himself declared that it is unconstitutional—yet Tyler is opposed to a Bank. Old Tip has invariably encouraged, supported and voted for a most extravagant and latitudinous system of Internal Improvements—yet Tyler is opposed to that also. Old Tip is very strongly suspected of Abolition; says, that he was a member of an Abolition society at the age of 18 years, and the Journals of Congress will show that all, or nearly all, of his Northern friends vote with the Abolitionists—yet Tyler is against Abolition," &c., &c. The contrast was perfect, and the cheers and applause of the Democracy plainly evinced that our Representative had drawn it with a master's hand; and no one could avoid seeing the paltry tricks and shameless imposture of Whiggery, in consenting to vote for these political antipodes at one and the same time.

Mr. Jones spoke for about two hours and a half, dissipating all the Whig humbugs into thin air; and at the conclusion of his speech, he told the people that he had much more to say, but, inasmuch, as his time was nearly out, (an agreement having been made between himself and his Whig opponent,) he would conclude by "deprecating the furious conduct of some of the Opposition leaders, who seemed determined to appeal to violence, and whose revolutionary and anarchical doctrines tended to a disruption of our glorious Union, to be succeeded by civil war, which would transform the present peaceful and happy aspect of our country into warlike encampments of bristling

bayonets and frowning battlements." (Cheers, cheers, cheers.)

When Mr. Jones had concluded, Mr. B. W. Leigh (who had been imported by the Whigs) rose to reply to our representative;—but, alas, how are the mighty fallen! Oh! Time—thou stern humbler of all pride and vigor, physical and intellectual—thou the GREAT LEVELLER (shall I say Loco Foco?) of the human race.—I see, thou arch rogue, that with thy scythe, so ample and so keen, thou hast not even spared the great Orator of Whiggery, Mr. B. W. Leigh. Mr. Leigh once possessed the reputation of being a master in the art of quibbling and making the utmost of a bad cause, but the charm is broken, and Mr. Leigh can no longer make white appear black and black white; or, in other words, he cannot gild with his sophistry the rottenness and deformities of Federal Whiggery. He still retains the will without the ability to quibble; and to his former fluency of speech, has succeeded repetition, dull, tiresome repetition. In his arguments and statements I had expected to hear at least something new, original or clever, owing to his great renown. But I was disappointed. His speech was a second edition of the R. Whig boiled down. The same assumptions; the same misrepresentations; the same *ex parte* statements; the same unfairness; the same want of liberality; the same violence; and almost the same disgusting personalities. Shall I number his principal arguments and propositions, Mr. Editor? Here they are:

1st. He told the people that General Jackson was the most presumptuous man on earth, (he forgot himself,) and that he had inherited his presumption from the devil!

2. He abused the Democratic Senators in the Senate of Virginia, and compared Messrs. Smith and Baptist, &c., to the horses which were tied to the Court-house yard! What decency!

3. He said that Mr. Van Buren was determined to destroy the whole banking system, and would, if re-elected, consummate the ruin of the whole country.—Now, Mr. Leigh knows better; he is no simpleton, and he knows that the President has himself disclaimed this slanderous imputation. (See his last annual Message, page 13, where he says that "banks in some form will probably always exist.") It was truly ridiculous to see Mr. Leigh's extreme pathos and sensibility in describing the sufferings of the widows and orphans, who are to be left portionless and starving, through Mr. Van Buren's hostility to the banks! "Many of them," said he, "have their all invested in bank stock, and how dreadful will be their condition!" What philanthropy! But this great man, this second Howard, forgot or "remembered to forget," that he himself has probably received a large fee from, and been employed for many weeks by, the EMBEZZLER of the funds of the Virginia Bank, in consequence of which embezzlement that bank has been unable to declare any dividends; and fearless and strong in the consciousness of right, I will here affirm, that this Whig quibbler ought to have told the people, that many widows and orphans are now suffering, and have not received their dividends, not on account of the President, but on account of Mr. Leigh's client having embezzled their property.

4. He charged Jackson, Benton, &c., with "having even debased the gold currency of the nation, by the act of 1834," and yet, he declared, almost in the same breath, that "he too, had voted for that debasing bill, for which sin he implored the forgiveness of the Almighty!" Now, what childish talk is this? What sort of a Statesman is this?

5. He charged Mr. Jones with having voted for certain appropriations, for Internal Improvement. Mr. Jones arose and denied the allegation, and called upon him to prove it. Being thus caught in a positive false assertion, Mr. Leigh made no other reply than a silly wink, and a "Ah! very well!" Now, a man who speaks thus at random, and who makes charges that he cannot sustain, ought to keep his peace.

6. He said, that Harrison was called the grumpy candidate, but that he (Mr. Leigh) was willing to rest the issue of the Presidential election upon the following scheme: Let us suppose, said he, that Gen. Harrison and one hundred men like himself were to be ranged on one side, and that General Van Buren and two hundred men like himself were to be ranged opposite to the former, and if at a given signal, the one hundred Harrisons would not drive the two hundred Van Burens into the Potomac, then he (Mr. Leigh) was willing to give up the contest, and to have Martin Van Buren re-elected! Now, Mr. Editor, you will agree with me, that in appealing to the relative physical and animal strength of the candidates, the Whig orator clearly showed that his cause and party are morally and politically indefensible. If brute force is to be appealed to, and if this principle of Mr. Leigh is to prevail, then I dare say, that Old Tip himself will not stand so good a chance of being elected as his English Bull, (which cost the log cabin proprietor \$800,) which, in point of physical strength, is greatly superior to his master, and fully equal to the task of pitching him into the Ohio or Potomac. The R. Whig was mistaken when it said that Mr. Leigh was 100 years behind the age—No, no,

Mr. Whig, your orator is not 100 but 500 or 600 years behind the age; inasmuch as he is willing to erect anew the institutions of the feudal ages—to do away with the ballot box—to appeal to force, and to decide the most grave political questions by fire or water ordeal or by single combat.

It was with feelings of surprise and indignation, that I listened to Mr. Leigh's abuse of the President's financial policy, and the Independent Treasury; and as I gazed upon that inconsistent gentleman, I thought of the following extract from his speech of 1834: "As to the place of deposit of the public treasure of the U. States, and the distribution and disbursement of it, Mr. Leigh had recently intimated the opinion, that the TRUE PRINCIPLES OF THE CONSTITUTION, according to the intention of its founders, would require that the Treasury should be DIVORCED FROM ALL CONNEXION WITH ANY BANK OR BANKS, State or Federal. The same proposition had been suggested by Mr. Gordon, at the last session of Congress; and the hint of it, in truth, was given by Mr. Jefferson, in a letter to Mr. Gallatin, in 1803." Thus spake Mr. B. W. Leigh, BEFORE the failure of the Banks, and yet he is now seeking to ostracize Mr. Van Buren for recommending the system AFTER the Banks have failed!!!! May the freemen of America never consent to be governed or deceived by the quibbles and unprincipled time-serving policy of inconsistent Whig lawyers!

In conclusion, I will remark, that Goochland, "the cockade of Democracy," can stand, and fears not the fire of the whole Federal phalanx. I feel proud of my fellow-Republicans; for, better Democrats and firmer men do not exist under the sun. Our people cannot be humbugged—and while our sister counties, Louisa and Fluvanna, have been betrayed, Goochland alone has withstood the storm, unappalled and unchanged. Indeed, so great is the aversion of our people to hear Whig slang, that they would not attend on Tuesday to listen to the limber-tongue of the Rev. John S. Pendleton, who had to address a small assemblage of Whigs.—Goochland will give Van Buren a greater vote than she did in 1836—for the People are up!

A GOOCHLAND DEMOCRAT.

THE ABOLITIONISTS.

The movement of the Abolitionists to effect a separate political organization in this State, has excited the notice, and alarmed the fears, of their Federal friends, in some sections. But we suspect with very little cause.

The Abolitionists of this State, and of every State in the Union, are nineteen-twentieths of them "Whigs," and opposed to the Democratic party and its candidates. Heretofore they have acted cordially with the party of which they are a component part; and that party, (the Federalists, or Whigs,) have acted cordially with them. They have played into each other's hands on all occasions, and as partisans have been in all respects identical. Indeed, Abolitionism was encouraged and petted by the Federalists, on the decline of Anti-Masonry—as an agent for a fresh excitement, lest the people of the Western part of the State, left to the calmer reflection of good sense and honest intention, would repudiate the trick and imposition by which those who, as the late anti-masonic leaders, assume to bind them to the car of Federal Whiggery.

While Mr. Van Buren and the Democracy of the State pursued towards them on all occasions a straightforward course of decided and unequivocal opposition to their views—regarding them as disturbing the constitutional guaranties, and as dangerous to the tranquility of the country, and the integrity of the Union—and treating them as such—the Federalists, or Whigs, have been in strict association with them—denouncing the South—demanding the Abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia—inflaming the public mind by getting up and presenting abolition petitions in Congress, and in the State Legislatures—concocting and passing abolition legislative expressions—issuing circulars to the Abolitionists, urging them to stand fast by their "Whig" or Harrison friends and candidates—passing abolition laws, literally subjecting a Southern resident to costs or fine or imprisonment if he shall attempt to look after "fugitives from other States"—their candidates pledging themselves to the abolition doctrines—and resorting, in short, to every means to ensure the continuance of Abolitionism to its "Whig" party allegiance.

The Abolition State Convention was almost wholly composed of "Whigs". There were a few exceptions. But nearly every man who took a leading part in the proceedings, (Messrs. Gerrit Smith, Tappan, Stewart, Holley, C. O. Shepard, Sawyer, &c., &c.) has been, down to this time, a "Whig" and has voted the "Whig" or Federal tickets, and no other. Not one of these has we presume, in the course of his life voted for Mr. V. B. or the Democratic tickets. Every candidate named we believe to have been a "Whig"—and such of the forty-two presidential electors as we know, except two, are of that school of politics.

Under such circumstances, it is not to be expected that the political Abolitionists, as a body, will quit their

old party associations with Federalism, and start out as an independent party. Some few,—those who have been active and foremost in this "independent" movement—are no doubt sincere; and will adhere to their distinct organization. But with the mass of those who profess to be Abolitionists, their Federal party obligations and affinities are far stronger than their abolition principles, and they will stick to their party. They will continue to act with their Federal or "Whig" associates. Not even an independent organization, (the support of Mr. Van Buren by them, in any sense, nobody ever imagined,) will be sustained by them. The result will show two facts, that the number of Abolitionists, distinct from Federalism and Gen. Harrison, is as "a drop in the bucket," and that Abolitionism and Federalism are identical. Of the sincerity of a desire on the part of those who assembled at Syracuse, and who nominated a distinct ticket, to separate themselves from existing party divisions, we have no doubt; but they will carry few of their "Whig" or Federal friends with them. And such is the view of the question, taken by a leading Federal newspaper in the region of political Abolitionism—the Buffalo Commercial Advertiser. That paper says:

"The Abolition nominations at the Syracuse Convention are no particular concern of ours, but it is well enough to call attention to one or two facts. Gerrit Smith, the nominee for Governor, was the Van Buren candidate last winter for United States Senator, in opposition to Mr. Tallmadge, and received the votes of Mr. Van Buren's most prominent friends in the Legislature. Mr. B. P. Johnson, one of the electors at large, has for the last twelve years been identified with the Van Buren party in Oneida county. No man of that party has been more prominent and active. These nominations furnish a sufficient key to the character and ulterior object of the Convention, and we are happy in being able to say, that the Abolitionists in this region, however fervently they may wish for the emancipation of the slave, correctly appreciate the whole maneuver. They will not sacrifice their distinctive political character as American citizens, (members of the 'Whig party'), having a great stake in the result of the pending contest, to support a nomination, which, under the guise of Abolition, is intended, whether they will or not, to transfer them to the support of Van Buren, who, as a propitiatory offering to the Moloch of slavery, gratuitously pledged himself in advance to veto an act of Congress, which might be passed, as he himself was forced to confess, under the power granted by the Constitution."

The allegation that Mr. Smith "was the Van Buren candidate last winter for U. S. Senator, in opposition to Mr. Tallmadge, and received the votes of Mr. V. B.'s most prominent friends in the legislature," is a falsehood, altogether, and without qualification. Mr. Gerrit Smith was named by a single friend of Mr. V. B., as a matter of pleasantry; but not one Van Buren member voted for him, nor were there indeed any votes for him. It was necessary to "sugar over" the design of the Federal article with this falsehood, in order to give effect and force to it. That design is to prevent the great body of Abolitionists, who are Federal Whigs, from being drawn away from their natural and usual association with the Federal Whigs and General Harrison. And their suspicions and prejudices are appealed to, through false representations as to the object of the persons who have taken part in the separate organization—the Federal paper at Buffalo being able to name one person, and one person only, of all who are selected as candidates (some fifty persons,) who is not a "Whig," or who may have been on some former occasion "identified with the Jackson Van Buren party." And in naming this person, it resorts to the finesse of confounding him, who may have been a political friend of Mr. Van Buren on some former occasion, but who is not so now, with Mr. A. B. Johnson, of Oneida, who stands now, and has done for years, in that relation. Knowing the force of the past party associations of the Abolitionists, the Federal paper at Buffalo announces authoritatively that they will not "sacrifice" or quit their Federal or Whig associates, nor the support of Gen. Harrison who, in his missives to the North (not intended for "the public eye") is an avowed Abolitionist, for any separate organization, "however fervently they may wish the emancipation of the slave." So we think.—*Albany Argus.*

TO THE PUBLIC.

(Correspondence.)

(Copies.—No. 1 by mail.)

FREDERICKSBURG, Aug. 13, 1840.

Sir—I am informed by one who was present at a regular meeting of the Tippecanoe Club, in the City of Richmond, that you attempted, by a resolution, to affix to my name the disgraceful epithets of blackguard and scoundrel, or words equally offensive. I should have called your attention to this subject at an earlier period, had I not met with some difficulty in obtaining the services of a proper friend with whom to counsel and advise in a matter that so deeply concerns me—that embarrassment has fortunately been removed in the proffer, by Lieut. Robert Emmet Hooe, of the U. S. Navy, of his services, and I accordingly avail myself of the very first opportunity to bring the matter to your consideration. Conscious, from the purity of my life and the character of my associations, that I have not merited such language, I hesitate to believe you have used it. If you have not, an unequivocal disavowal on your part would seem to be required, not only as an act of justice to me, but yourself. It is possible, however, that these or similar expressions may have escaped you under the influence of political excitement, owing to

my connection with the press.—If this be so, I hope you will properly appreciate the necessity which impels me to require of you such reparation, as, upon calmer reflection, you may think me entitled to claim. The nature of this communication, will suggest to you the propriety of returning an answer as early as possible. I shall remain at this place for a reasonable time to hear from you.

Yours, &c., &c.,
J. M. SMITH.

JAMES LYONS, Esq., Richmond, Va.

(No. 2 by mail.)

RICHMOND, August 15, 1840.

Sir: Upon my return to Town last night I received your letter of the 13th, requesting me to inform you whether it is true, as reported to you, that I had pronounced you a scoundrel and a blackguard at a meeting of the Tippecanoe Club. You do not state to which meeting you allude, but I presume you allude to the meeting held on Monday, the 5th of this month.—On that occasion I did say, that which every gentleman who spoke, re-affirmed, and the Club would have declared unanimously, if required to do so, viz: that the man who, besides the numerous foul epithets which you have heaped upon the Whig party in your "Crisis," has been so lost to all sense of propriety as to say, that "all swindlers are Whigs, and *e converso*," as you have done, was too much of a blackguard to be invited by gentlemen to come into their house or elsewhere, to enter into equal discussion with them.—Entertaining that opinion still, I have no "reparation" to offer for expressing it. As to "the purity of your private life," I know nothing, and have therefore said nothing; and your informant is wrong, therefore, in saying that I pronounced you a scoundrel, as I did not do so, but expressly said, that I did not speak of your integrity.

When a member of the Club, upon a prior occasion, pronounced a statement, of which you have since acknowledged yourself to be the author, to be "a lie," and another proposed to call upon the Editor for his proof, you complained of an "attempt to gag the Press," and abused the Club. Now, I do not desire to gag the Press, nor even play the Censor over it, grossly licentious as it is; but when it deals in wholesale defamation of one half at least, if not (as I believe) a majority of the people, I hold, that as one of those people, I have a right to decline intercourse with the conductor of it, and to give my reason for doing so.—When that right is lost to me, and to others of course in common with me, a strange despotism will have overtaken us—one full as odious as that of Kings, but much less decent.

As your questions to me have been propounded in respectful terms, I have felt that you were entitled to a respectful answer; but I beg leave to say, that here the correspondence between us will terminate.

Yours, &c., &c.,

JAMES LYONS.

To J. M. SMITH, Esq., Fredericksburg.

Upon the receipt of this note, which cut off all further explanation between us, my only alternative was, to despatch my friend to Richmond, furnished with such papers and powers as would enable him to negotiate the matter to an honorable termination. This course I adopted without hesitation or delay.—Subjoined is the result of that negotiation:

(No. 3.)

RICHMOND, Aug. 17th, 1840.

Sir: The undersigned has arrived in your city, this evening, charged with business of a personal nature with yourself. The undersigned has despatched this note to inform Mr. Lyons that he is now in Richmond, at the Swan Tavern, and will avail himself of an early opportunity to pay his respects to Mr. Lyons, in person, to-morrow. In the interim (if agreeable to Mr. Lyons) the undersigned will be happy to see Mr. Lyons at his lodgings.

Very respectfully,
ROBT. EMMET HOOE, U. S. Navy.

MR. JAS. LYONS.

Swan Tavern, Monday, Aug. 17, 1840.

In the interview which followed this note, my friend submitted to Mr. Lyons the following extracts from the Crisis, with which I had furnished him:

(From the Crisis, July 29, 1840.)

"No man of intelligence or candor, who will read our article, can believe, that we meant to apply the term 'swindler' to the Whigs individually, as the 'Whig' affects to regard it. We made use of the term in a 'political' sense *expressly*, and added that some few occasionally avowed their 'Federalism.' Why will the Whig pervert our meaning?"

(From the same, Aug. 5, 1840.)

"Can it be expected that he will fail to expose any atrocities that may be perpetrated by individuals in a distant State calling themselves Whigs, because forsooth the Tippecanoe Club of this city may thereby consider it a reflection upon them? A pretty doctrine indeed! The motives of the Assistant have been grossly misunderstood—prejudice has blinded many who now join in the cry against him.—He has no animosity against Richmond, or any of its citizens. In all he has done, he has been governed solely by his sense of duty as an Editor. If he has used strong language, it was not designed to reflect on the personal or private honor of any man here, nor upon any elsewhere, who were innocent of having done what was charged?"

The view taken by Mr. Lyons of these extracts, is explained in the following note—that taken by my friend, in No. 5, which closes the Correspondence:

(No. 4.)

RICHMOND, August 18, 1840.

Sir: Regarding the language of the first piece from the Crisis, shewn me, by you, this morning, and which, as you suggested, I had never seen before, I do not think it could be received as a retraxit of the language, on his part, which drew from me the epithet which I applied to him, of a blackguard. But, confiding in your knowledge of Mr. Smith's sentiments, and your assurance, in our interview this morning, that it was intended as a retraxit, and was so regarded by you—and looking to the declaration in the extract of the fifth of August, that it was not the design of the Editor in the first article "to reflect upon the private honor of any man, here or elsewhere," I have no difficulty in withdrawing the epithet which I applied to Mr. Smith, that epithet having been drawn from me, as I stated at the time I used it, and in my letter to Mr. Smith, by the language of the Crisis.

Respectfully, your ob't serv't,

JAMES LYONS.

To Lieut. R. E. HOOE.

(No. 5.)

RICHMOND, Aug. 18, 1840.

Sir—Your letter of this day's date, handed me by Mr. Wickham, I am happy to say, terminates honorably and amicably the controversy existing with my friend, Mr. Smith, and yourself. Mr. Smith was actuated by no motive other than a stern determination to maintain, and if necessary to defend, his personal honor, which he believed you had assailed. The extracts submitted to you from the Crisis, I certainly regarded as a retraxit on the part of Mr. Smith, of any language reflecting personally on the character of the Whigs. The withdrawal, therefore, by you, of the offensive epithet which you had applied to Mr. Smith, leaves him no other ground of complaint.

Respectfully, your ob't serv't,

ROBT. EMMET HOOE, U. S. Navy.

MR. JAS. LYONS, Richmond.

To the above Correspondence, I will add a few words by way of explanation:

1st. Mr. Lyons says, that I said "all swindlers are Whigs, and *e converso*." Now, injustice is done me here. I added, "politically speaking." The first form of expression admits of no explanation, and would have been highly offensive—qualified, however, by a "political" sense, I could have shown, that not the slightest insult was intended, as was really the fact. As a man or an Editor, no one is more cautious than I am in giving insult.

2d. Mr. Lyons is in error, if he supposes that I ever "acknowledged" myself the "author" of the "statement" which was "afterwards" said to be "a lie" by a "member" or members of the Club; or, that I complained, on that account, of an "attempt to gag the press." When an epithet of such a nature is applied to any statement of my own, I shall be the last man to utter such complaint. I only intended to avow myself the "author" of an article containing statements based on information from other sources, and not on any personal knowledge of my own, and for the truth of which I did not and could not vouch. If I had not, why the proof I adduced? If the Correspondence had not been cut short by Mr. Lyons, or I could have continued it consistently with self-respect, I should have offered him an explanation, notwithstanding the aggravating matter contained in his letter to me, that would, in the estimation of many of his own political friends, have been satisfactory.

3d. Mr. Lyons says, that I "abused the Club." I am not aware of having done so. My address to the Club so far from being abusive, must, in the judgment of dispassionate men, have been considered highly respectful. True, I complained of their treatment, but never abused them.

4th. As the word "retraxit" has been mentioned in the Correspondence, I will take occasion to repeat, in the spirit of the extracts published above, and other editorials by me, that it never was my design to reflect "personally on the character of the Whigs." My friend, therefore, was right in entering a "retraxit" for me, in so far as he believed I had thus reflected. The public will perceive, that in this, there is nothing which compromises "the liberty of the press," or in any respect debars me from the use of any "language" I may think proper to express in future my "political" sentiments.

Respectfully,

J. M. SMITH.

(From the Baltimore Republican.)

TEMPERANCE vs. HARD CIDER.

As another proof, if proof were needed, of the great danger to be apprehended from the sway of the "Hard Cider Banner" of the Whigs, we cut from the Sunday School Journal, the following pledge taken by the youths of Harrisburg, Pa., at their celebration of the 4th of July. We cannot too much approve the far-seeing philosophy of engraving in the youthful pledge a caution calculated to restrain young persons from being led away by the hard cider enthusiasm, which the Harrisonians are endeavoring to create, in the very reckless.

ness of all moral consequences, over the length and breadth of this devoted land.

PLUNDER.

A pledge we make,
No wine to take;
Nor brandy red,
To turn the head;
Nor whiskey hot,
That makes the sot;
Nor fiery rum,
That ruins home;
Nor will we sin,
By drinking gin;
Hard cider too,
Will never do;
Nor brewer's beer,
Our hearts to cheer.

To quench our thirst, we always bring
Cold water from the well or spring,
So here we pledge perpetual hate
To all that can intoxicate.

Fathers and mothers see this! Reflect, if there must be not something intrinsically wrong in a cause which resorts to such expedients to obtain its ends; expedients, which irresistibly lead to the degradation of the young men of our country. A FATHER.

AN OLD DEMOCRAT.

We have no doubt, that the following letter, addressed to the committee of invitation to the late Republican dinner in Winchester, will be read with some interest by our readers—proceeding as it does from Maj. Roberts, a brave and gallant officer in the War of Independence. Maj. Roberts was elected to the Virginia Legislature in '96, and served 14 years in that body. He warmly opposed the Black Cockade Administration of the elder Adams, to whose Administration Gen. Harrison admits that he "certainly felt sentiments favorable." But Maj. R.'s letter will best speak for itself.

LAUREL HILL, July 22, 1840.

"Gentlemen: I have received your invitation to the Democratic festival, in or near Winchester, Frederick county, and would be with you, if my advanced age would allow. I am now 83 years old, and though my health is good for my years, I cannot risk so long a journey."

"I witnessed the American Revolution, and partook of its hardships in the field. Independence was achieved; but liberty was still in peril. I saw the Federal Constitution go into action and witnessed its workings. I was elected to the Legislature by my native county in 1796, and served it in that body 14 years. In the memorable struggle between liberty and power, from '98 to 1801, I was an actor in the Legislature, and an observer of men, of principles and events. My votes are on the journals, and my principles may be seen by my votes. I passed through the reign of terror, and witnessed the era of the black cockade, when its shade fell on the eagle of liberty. I saw Virginia standing almost alone in that memorable and pregnant crisis.—Kentucky, the first-born of her womb, shouldered her arms to fall with the public liberty, if we were defeated. We saw what the bullet had done for us against its foreign foe, and our trust in the ballot against its intestine adversary. It saved us THEN. In all those conflicts, we had the same enemy to contend with.—We are engaged in the same struggle now, and against the same adversary, and the ballot box will again save us, if the people have fair play. There is all my fear.—Reason is not left free to combat error.—The cat is so covered in meal, it is hard to see.—We have the log cabin candidate, whose drink is hard cider, and we find that candidate in the person of a member of an ancient family, whose patrimony is the influence of riches.—Others had to work for influence and favors. This personage found it in his cradle. His competitor is held up as the candidate of the palace, arrayed in its gorgeous ornaments, though every man, who so represents him, knows that he was a poor and portionless boy, rising, and now has risen, from indigence and penury, by force of his own merit, aided only by that genius which is his fortune, and by those virtues, that are his acts.

The scenes through which I have passed in public life, suggest the following toast, which you may drink, if you choose: The bullet and the ballot, the true defence of liberty: The first achieved our independence; the latter will preserve to us constitutional freedom.

"I am, gentlemen, with good wishes for the cause you are engaged in, and my respects to you, individually, your most obedient servant,

"JOHN ROBERTS."

Yes, let the people have fair play—away with your log cabins, cider barrels, coon skins, and all that class of miserable humbug. Let the people have fair play—let the voice of truth and reason be heard, and all will be well.

A Fact to be noted.

Morehead, Governor elect for North Carolina, is, we are informed, the same man who offered in the Convention of 1835, in that State, a proposition to preserve to "free negroes the right of voting for members of the House of Commons."—In the Eastern part of N. Carolina, Saunders, the Van Buren candidate, beat Morehead 5,000 votes—several thousand more than Spright beat Dudley in 1836. Morehead beat Saunders in the Western part, where Morehead resides,

upwards of 13,000 votes—making a majority of more than 8,000 in favor of the Free Negro Governor.

THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.

Indiana, Kentucky and North Carolina have gone against the Democratic party of the country by decided majorities. It is believed, however, that these majorities are due, in the main, to the most disgraceful frauds and impositions that have ever been practised in this country. We cannot now encumber our columns with the proof to sustain the imputation; but must content ourselves by invoking the friends of freedom in Virginia to stand by *Argus-eyed* at the approaching election in November, and prevent, by every peaceable means in their power, any effort the Federalists may make to carry the election by fraud or spurious voting. The success with which these efforts have been attended in other States, render it highly probable, if not certain, that like efforts will be made here. One single State may turn the scale, and aware of that fact, depend upon it, the Federalists will scruple at nothing to secure it for Gen. Harrison. Let them brag and boast and bet as they will, their confidence is not inspired by their claims upon the country, or the justice of their cause, but by well laid plans and schemes to juggle and manoeuvre the people out of their votes. Be vigilant, Democrats, and all will be well. We have a majority on our side beyond doubt of the *bona fide* free citizens of the country. That majority can only be counter-vailed by such means as were resorted to by Pennington in New Jersey, Ritner in Pennsylvania, and the Naylor fraud of false ballots or false counting. Be of good cheer! Be up and doing. North Carolina will in all probability return to the fold before November. Besides, the election of Governor is no test of Mr. Van Buren's strength. The Whig Governor was elected in 1836 by 5,000 majority, and yet Mr. Van Buren carried the State in the fall of the same year. He may yet carry the State, as we believe he will, this fall; but if not, we can spare her and elect Mr. V. B. Tennessee will certainly vote for Mr. V. B. The Whigs claim Tennessee. We can give them Tennessee and beat them. The Whigs must be beaten—they ought to be beaten. Let every Democrat say they shall be beaten, and depend upon it, it will be so. No flinching or dodging.—Toe the mark, Democrats! toe the mark! and our country will triumph over American and British stock-jobbers. We have placed New York down in the list of States that will vote for Mr. Van Buren. This conviction, whatever doubts may have heretofore existed, is fast rivetting itself upon the public mind of both parties. We hear it conceded by men of all parties occasionally, that New York will vote for Mr. Van Buren—that she will not abandon her own son at a time like the present, and thus furnish the reproach against herself, of having been the first state in this Union, which ever committed an act of such injustice and ingratitude.—New York will vote for M. Van Buren. But, if New York should not, and Tennessee, Georgia and Ohio should, or any number of the doubtful States, sufficient to make up 38 electoral votes should, then Mr. Van Buren will be re-elected President of the U. S. Doubt not the issue of the coming contest; for, in so doubting, you cast a reproach upon the people. But be zealous, watchful, and ever ready to put down calumny. Examine the following table of States, and reason with your neighbor on the prospect ahead. Mr. Van Buren must be elected. General Harrison is sustained by a powerful, reckless and noisy Opposition; but remember the old adage, that "a grasshopper in a field will make more noise than twelve beehives grazing." We have put down all the States to one or the other of the competitors for the Presidency, but such as are doubtful have been referred to, and will be italicized:

FOR MR. VAN BUREN.	FOR GEN. HARRISON.
Maine	10 Vermont
New Hampshire	7 Massachusetts
New York	14 Connecticut
Pennsylvania	6 Rhode Island
Maryland	4 New Jersey
Virginia	10 Delaware
South Carolina	23 North Carolina
Alabama	11 Louisiana
Illinois	5 Kentucky
Missouri	15 Indiana
Mississippi	4 Michigan
Arkansas	3
Ohio	21
Georgia	15 Necessary to a choice
Tennessee	148
	Wanting
Necessary to a choice	57
To spare	55

The assistant Editor of this paper feels at liberty to say now, what before he could not say, that the article below was regarded by him as objectionable at the time it was written, on account of its apparent personal bearing, and was marked out in the revise, but through neglect to send it to the office was inadvertently published: thus showing conclusively, that so far from a design to give personal offence, there was apprehension it might do so. In making this acknowledgment he does not desire to be understood as surrendering his right as an Editor, to employ any language he may please, to stigmatize political principles—advocate them who

may. "The liberty of the Press," says the Constitution, "shall not be abridged;" and whilst he is disposed at all times to use that "liberty" with a due regard to the rights and feelings of others, as well as his own self-respect, he will not be limited in his language.—He hopes that this statement will be satisfactory to all:

"Baer, the blacksmith, turns out to be a swindler—nothing else is wanting to make it a good Whig currency—all swindlers are Whigs, and *e converso*, politically speaking—we occasionally meet with one who avows his Federalism."

The Taste and Decency of the Whigs!

[From Baer's Speech.] [From Friday's Whig.]
"You might dump a barrel of Mr. Travis R. Daniel, in the Log Cabin, on Wednesday night last, addressing the Tippecanoe Club:—He invoked the counties to send large Delegations to the State Convention here on the 5th October, and the Whigs to stick by their log cabins and hard cider, the emblems of Reform.—Whigs, he said, Republicans could go hard cider; but, if it did not give the Loco Focos, by the 1st of Nov., the back door trait, he was greatly mistaken. (Roars of laughter and applause.)"

Exquisite taste!—and fortunately such pearls were not thrown away upon swine. But there were roars of laughter and applause! We shall not animadvert upon what Dr. Chamberlayne is said to have uttered on the same night in the same log cabin—and the "withering sneer," which is said to have curled the lips of the assemblage, at our expense. We rather believe that the R. Whig has done gross injustice to Dr. C., than that he has done such gross injustice to us, by garbling what we recently said on the Tallahassee affair.

More Logic of the Log Cabin!

One of the Whig Electors is said to have argued lately in the Tippecanoe Club of Va., No. 1, that Mr. V. Buren could not be re-elected, because no President had ever been re-elected, who had not the final on in his name, as Washington, Jefferson, &c., &c. But if the argument be true, how comes it about that James Monroe was re-elected? Cannot Van Buren break the spell as well as Monroe? Such bright emanations of intellect, however, appropriately belong to the log cabin. We may be told perhaps next, that Harrison ought to be re-elected, because he has the auspicious on to his name. Heaven knows, what the aspiring Henry would say to this species of logic. It would postpone the gratification of his ambition, until he had passed three score years and ten.

It is but two months to the Presidential Election. As we have but a few numbers of the Crisis to issue, and as we wish to make it as useful as possible, we have determined to reduce the price of its Sybilline leaves to the lowest point. We will henceforth publish it, therefore, at 25 cents for each subscriber, until the Presidential Election—5 copies for \$1—22 copies for \$5—and 50 copies for \$10.—The 22 and the 50 copies, being sent in packets, to be addressed to some particular individual, and distributed by himself. The Committee of Vigilance in each county might take them, and circulate them among their friends. We promise to make the contents as effective as possible—stripping the original matter of all personal allusions, and selecting the best and strongest doct-
trines, speeches, and articles for general information. It will, of course, contain all the Proceedings, Addresses, Reports, &c., of the approaching Charlottesville Convention, Davis's Speech, &c., &c.
A number of additional copies may be obtained, by sending orders beforehand to this office, at the rate of \$3 per hundred copies, cash—but all orders must be post paid.

(From the Harrisburg Magician, August 22.)

The "Keystone" State Awake!—The Democracy of the "Keystone" is every where in motion. Large and enthusiastic meetings have been held in almost every section of the State, and where this has not already been the case, they are advertised, and will shortly take place. In a number of counties the Democrats have also nominated their tickets, and are moving forward in solid, unbroken phalanx. Our friends abroad may rest assured, that the Democracy of Pennsylvania will do the work handsomely this fall. At the annual election they will carry at least 19 of the 28 members of Congress and maintain their ascendancy in both branches of the Legislature. The Presidential election will crown their triumph by a majority of upwards of TWENTY THOUSAND for Van Buren and Johnson—which we shall consider "glory enough for one year." Such is the prospect in Pennsylvania. What say our friends? Will this be sufficient?

A CARD.

The Chairman of the Democratic Committee of Vigilance for the county of Powhatan, at the instance of a member of the Committee and other citizens of the county, having requested the Hon. John W. Jones to postpone his intended Address to the people of Powhatan, from September, until the October Court for said county, for the purpose of enabling Mr. Jones, as well as the Delegates from Powhatan, to attend the Democratic Convention at Charlottesville; and Mr. Jones having consented to the same, notice is hereby given, that Mr. Jones will not address the people of Powhatan at the September Court, but will certainly do so at the October Court following.

MARKETS—RICHMOND, September 2, 1840.
COUNTRY FLOUR—Stock light and receipts small—safes of new at \$5, old \$5.
CITY MILLS—\$5.
WHEAT—Red, 105 cents—white, 110 cents.
CORN—45 cents. Some demand for shipment.
TOBACCO—Inspections tight—but no change in price.